

**PATENT APPLICATION**  
**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**  
**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 1794**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Yoshio AKIYAMA et al.

Group Art Unit: 1794

Application No.: 10/521,588

Examiner: M. JACOBSON

Filed: September 6, 2005

Docket No.: 122473

For: BLOW MOLDED ARTICLE

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the May 29, 2008 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are pending.

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, asserting that the term "low compatibility" is indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim must be interpreted in light of the disclosure in the specification when ascertaining whether claim terms are indefinite. Paragraph [0070] of the specification, for example, states that the resin material has a low compatibility with the outer layer 1a "thereby allowing to provide a laminated peelable container." Therefore, based on Applicants' disclosure, those skilled in the art, who have sufficient knowledge in the materials used to produce the blow molded article, would

OK TO ENTER: /M.J./